

MINUTES
of the
Mental Health Planning Advisory Council
meeting on
October 29, 2002
held at
Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services
Building One, Second Floor
Tillim Room
480 Galletti Way
Sparks, NV 89431-5573

I. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, INTRODUCTIONS

Alyce Thomas, Chair of the Council, called the meeting to order at 10:05 am.

Members present:

- | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| • Aitken, Nancy | • Jackson, Barbara |
| • Bennett, Bob | • Johnson, Rosetta |
| • Caloiaro, Dave | • Parra, Debbie |
| • Clark, Jerry | • Rodriguez, Jenita |
| • Crowe, Kevin | • Taycher, Karen |
| • Cooley, Judge W. | • Thomas, Alyce |
| • DeJan, Emil | • Uptergrove, Anna |
| • Doyle, Mike | |

Members absent:

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| • Dopf, Gloria (excused) | • Legier, Barbara (excused) |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|

Staff and others in attendance:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| • Brandenburg, Carlos – MHDS | • Waltz, Maryellen – Carson City Mental Health Coalition |
| • Hernandez, Kim – Nevada PEP | • Zeiser, Andrew– Administrative Consultant |
| • Tyler, Joe – NNAMHS | |

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS

Alyce Thomas asked for questions and comments on the minutes. Andrew Zeiser stated that Jenita Rodriguez contacted him and requested that he read a statement to be entered into the minutes for today's meeting. He then read the statement. Alyce then asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the July 12 and August 26, 2002, meetings.

Judge Cooley interjected to indicate that she did not feel it was appropriate to enter Jenita's statement into today's minutes without her present to discuss the issues brought up. She then made a motion to table the entry of the statement into the minutes.

MOTION: Made by Judge Cooley, seconded by Ann Uptergrove, to table the entry of Jenita Rodriguez's statement into today's meeting minutes until she is present to speak to the Council about it.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

Alyce then reiterated her request for a motion to approve the minutes from the prior two meetings.

MOTION: Made by Mike Doyle, seconded by Dave Caloiaro, to accept the minutes from the July 12 and August 26, 2002, meetings as submitted.

MAJORITY VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

ABSTAINED: Karen Taycher

III. REVIEW AND APPROVE PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGES

Alyce Thomas began by asking if the Council members had a chance to review the proposed bylaw changes distributed in the meeting packets. She then asked that Judge Cooley and Dave Caloiaro review the relevant changes. Dave provided a brief review of the proposed changes and then asked about the financial impact of the proposed language to add members to the Council. Both Alyce and Andrew indicated that the Council's budget will allow for this. Dave then pointed out Emil DeJan's requested change that the Grievance Committee be identical to the Executive Committee. However, if a grievance is made against an Executive Committee member, a separate ad hoc Grievance Committee would be formed.

Debbie Parra then pointed out that Medicaid was missing in Council representation categories outlined under Article II, Section 2. Andrew noted that this would be added to the next draft of bylaws set forth for approval. Alyce then asked for more discussion. Kevin Crowe brought up Article X, Section 2, Item 6, which includes language to empower the Administrator for the Division of Mental Health and Developmental Services (MHDS) to serve as the final arbitrator for decisions not accepted by grievants who have appealed to the Grievance Committee. Kevin

believes the decision of the Grievance Committee should be final and that additional recourse to the Division Administrator is not necessary. Making the MHDS Administrator the final decision maker might put him or her in an awkward position. If the Council deems this necessary, he suggested that the final arbitrator could be a designee of the Administrator.

Alyce said she believes there should be another level of recourse. Emil agreed and said that this seems logical because there has to be someone to appeal to beyond the Grievance Committee. Alyce pointed out that the Council works with both MHDS and the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), and she feels that both Administrators should be represented in the process. Dave suggested that the language might be changed so that an appeal could be made either to the Administrator for MHDS or DCFS, and that this decision would be considered final. Dave said he agrees with Alyce and Emil that one additional level of recourse is appropriate. He also said that choosing a designee, as suggested by Kevin, may not be appropriate. In response, Alyce said she is concerned that funding decisions related to the Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS) Block Grant may be appealed to a Division Administrator, who may then have a conflict interest.

Karen Taycher said she believes that the Division Administrators should not be elevated as the final authorities over the Council. Rather, objectionable actions should be appealed to the Governor because this is who appoints the members. Judge Cooley suggested that the Grievance Committee could bring recommendations to the Council as a whole and this could be the end of the process. She reminded everyone that this proposed change to the bylaws was intended to avoid lengthy discussion of disagreements at meetings. If grievances were referred back to the Council as a whole from the Grievance Committee, this would make the Council the final authority.

Rosetta Johnson said that if grievances are handled through the Council alone, there may be prejudice on the part of some members. If a member has an objection or complaint, she believes it should go to an unbiased group. Rosetta agreed with Karen that the best choice is for grievances to be referred to the Governor's office. Karen clarified that she did not intend to include specific language in the bylaws that grievances go to the Governor's office, but rather that a member would be able to seek such recourse as an appointee of the Governor. More discussion followed.

Emil emphasized that the Division Administrators are "arms" of the Governor's office, and he reiterated that there should be a level of appeal beyond the Council. Alyce said she does not think the Governor can be named in the bylaws. She agrees that if a member does not like the Council's decision, a grievance can always be taken to the Governor's office. However, this does not need to be spelled out in the bylaws.

Emil asked that the Attorney General (AG) for MHDS or DCFS be consulted regarding to what level grievances can be appealed. Alyce said she would be willing to contact the Governor's office to see if they have staff that serves in this capacity. Kevin agreed to work with Alyce to have the AG review the suggested changes and provide a recommendation as to who would function as another level of recourse for grievances. Alyce asked who the Deputy AG is for MHDS. Kevin said Ed Irwin. Alyce asked if he represents DCFS also. Kevin and Jerry said no.

Emil suggested that the matter be referred to the AG for the Department of Human Resources (DHR), Cindy Pyzel. Dave suggested that the State Division of Administration might be named to handle appeals and serve as an unbiased body.

Alyce agreed to contact Cindy Pyzel. Nancy Aitken asked if some of the changes to the bylaws could be approved today. Andrew said that all proposed changes to the bylaws need to be noticed prior to the next meeting, per Article XI, and that the Council should not pick and choose pieces to approve.

Judge Cooley suggested that Item 6 under Article X could be amended to state that the grievant would have any appeal options that they deem appropriate in order to expedite approval of the changes. More discussion followed. Andrew again pointed out that Article XI requires notice of bylaw changes in advance of a meeting and recommended that the Council abide by this.

Karen then asked Kevin about another concern he brought up earlier. Kevin asked about tracking of excused and unexcused absences. Andrew pointed out existing and proposed language under Article III, Section 1, that provides general guidelines for absences and empowers the Chair to make determinations about whether they are excused or unexcused.

Alyce asked if the Council members would like to table the discussion until further work is done to consult with the AG and revise the proposed language further. Nancy Aitken made a motion accordingly.

MOTION: Made by Nancy Aitken, seconded by Anna Uptergrove, to table discussion of modifications to the bylaws until further information is gathered from the Attorney General's office.

Judge Cooley asked again if the language proposed for today can be approved. Alyce reminded everyone again about the noticing requirements under Article XI, Section 1. She then called for a vote to table further discussion as set forth in the above motion.

MAJORITY VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

IV. APPROVE DRAFT OF FY 2002 CMHS BLOCK GRANT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

Alyce Thomas began by asking Andrew Zeiser to provide an overview of the CMHS Block Grant Implementation Report draft. Andrew reviewed the table of contents, explaining the key items of information that are reported on, including the previous fiscal year's funding priorities and grant expenditures. He highlighted the data to be gathered for the performance indicator data tables, and explained the new uniform data requirements being implemented by CMHS. He also pointed out that this was the first time a draft of the Implementation Report has come before the Council for comments prior to submission. In past years, the time frame for completion of the report was too late to allow for review at a Council meeting. Andrew noted that not only is a

draft ready earlier this year, but staff from both MHDS and DCFS have been working to address the new uniform data requirements for quite some time now.

Rosetta Johnson asked how it was that the draft was put together earlier. Andrew and Kevin Crowe both emphasized that the ongoing goal has been to improve the grant timeline and increase coordination between the two Divisions. Each year, this has resulted in earlier work on grant documents, including the both the Block Grant Application as well as the Implementation Report.

Kevin then discussed the uniform data requirements in more detail. He explained that CMHS staff could not compile the disparate data from the performance indicator data tables, which are self-chosen by states, and present it to Congress in a coherent manner. The uniform data requirements were developed partially in response to the Surgeon General's declaration of mental health as a public health priority. Rosetta asked how Nevada's self-chosen indicators compare with the new uniform data requirements. Kevin said that because this is the first year, staff is in the process of comparing the two. He did note that there is some crossover, particularly for fiscal indicators. He emphasized that staff is looking at the data in much more detail based on the new requirements.

Kevin reviewed the existing Performance Indicators and pointed out that some contain very useful data that staff is already gathering. He reviewed Criterion 5, which includes fiscal indicators of community-based expenditures for adult services. Karen asked about community-based expenditures for children. Kevin said this table only reflects expenditures for adult services. He then provided more detail about MHDS expenditures. He explained that the state's population growth, which exceeds budget growth, results in statistically fewer expenditures per capita over time. He also mentioned the data analysis that will be performed by the MHDS graduate intern to provide information to the Council. Rosetta asked about the qualifications of the graduate intern. Kevin said that the intern, Jared Chase, majors in behavioral analysis.

Kevin then reviewed some of the uniform data requirement tables in detail, explaining the types of demographic data in which the federal government is interested. Based on the complexity and detail of the tables, Kevin believes it will take about two or three years to standardize the data collection for them. In the coming years, he hopes to provide this uniform data and analysis so that it can be broken out regionally and nationally. Rosetta asked about data on persons served and whether it includes average length of stay. Kevin said this is included in the tables. He then highlighted table 5.A, which specifies Medicaid and non-Medicaid supported services.

Rosetta then asked about recidivism. Kevin said that the item in table 6, entitled *Additions During the Year*, reflects reentries into the system. Kevin underscored that CMHS built this data collection instrument and has defined these items accordingly. Emil said that the *Total Served* item in table 6 is an unduplicated count by definition. Kevin again pointed out that readmissions during a given year count as client reentries into the system, and therefore reflect recidivism. More discussion followed about the counting of entries into the system and whether it adequately reflects a recidivism rate. Anna Uptergrove then asked about the developmental services population. Kevin reminded her that the Block Grant focuses only on mental health clients.

Dave Caloiaro asked about statistics on children served in non-State hospitals. Kevin reminded everyone that Nevada is one of the few states that does not rely heavily on managed care and/or private providers. More discussion followed.

Kevin then highlighted table 8, which requests data on Council activities. He said this is indicative of the CMHS focus on Council involvement in the State mental health system. Alyce pointed out that many councils across the country do not have the power to influence mental health service decisions. Based on her work at the national level, she understands that Nevada's Council is becoming a national model because of its work and funding activities. More discussion followed.

Rosetta asked about the MHDS budget. Kevin said that Carlos Brandenburg will be present later today to provide information about Legislative issues and answer budget related questions.

Kevin moved on to discuss more of the data tables. He highlighted table 11, which reflects consumer feedback on the provision of services. Karen Taycher pointed out that this table asks about how the state gathers satisfaction data, not just what the data is. She thinks this is a positive sign that CMHS is interested in how data is collected. More discussion followed about the implementation of consumer surveys in Nevada. Kevin brought up training on consumer satisfaction survey implementation being provided to MHDS by the National Technical Assistance Center (NTAC). Karen asked about inclusion of Neighborhood Care Center staff in this training. Kevin said he is willing to discuss this with her.

Kevin also discussed the fact that CMHS has other developmental tables that may be added to the uniform data requirements in the future.

Rosetta asked if a new computer system will be required to address the requested data. Kevin brought up the new Creative Sociomedics (CSM) software system being purchased by MHDS, which will have these data elements designed into it. Rosetta asked if implementation of the new system has been started. Kevin said they have completed a gap analysis between the Advanced Institutional Management Software (AIMS), which is the old data system, and CSM. Rosetta asked about funding for the system. Kevin discussed the Data Infrastructure Grant (DIG), which will offset some of the cost and provide funding for travel and training related to implementation of the new system. Kevin also noted that the new system, which includes a considerable amount of computer hardware infrastructure, is the Division's second budget priority. First year costs are estimated at approximately \$1.8 million. He underscored the need to create hardware infrastructure across the state. The initial rollout of the new system will be at Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (NNAMHS) and Rural Clinics. The second year it will go statewide to include Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (SNAMHS). Kevin then provided more detail about the rollout of the information system across the next several years.

Karen clarified that this data development plan is for adult mental health only. Kevin said yes. Jerry Clark said that DCFS has already completed the implementation of their own data system, Unified Nevada Information Technology for Youth (UNITY). He said they are in the third year of its use.

Karen then asked how MHDS and DCFS are coordinating these plans with the Disability Task Force activities surrounding uniform data collection across human services agencies. Specifically, she asked if other agencies will interface with the MHDS system. Kevin pointed out that Mojave, a private provider, is already linked to the existing AIMS system and will also be linked with CSM. Karen asked if MHDS interfaces with the County systems. Kevin said that there are currently no County-based mental health services for adults. Karen confirmed that there are discussions among Administrators within DHR about interfacing their data systems. Kevin said MHDS has worked with Medicaid to ensure an interface with their new data system. As far as coordination beyond this, he said this is a grey area that has often been a weak point in data collection.

Dave commented that Nevada Medicaid is currently the only state without a Management Information System (MIS) and that the implementation of their new system will create a centralized system that coordinates data collection across a variety of services and programs. He said that they hope to be online by October 1, 2003.

Following up on Karen's questions, Jerry clarified that for children's mental health there is no specific data system. UNITY is a child welfare system. However, he noted that DCFS plans to partner with MHDS to integrate children's data into their new system.

V. REVIEW AND APPROVE CMHS BLOCK GRANT FUNDING SPLIT CHANGE

Alyce Thomas stated that this topic will be tabled until she is able to have further discussions with Ed Cotton and Carlos Brandenburg prior to bringing it before the Council for consideration.

She then moved on to discuss the opening of the Canteen Employment Learning Lab at NNAMHS. Currently, staff is finalizing the hiring of the storekeepers for the Canteen. She explained that initially there was difficulty with the fiscal process required to hire them and that staff is working on developing a way to make this happen.

Based on the Council's support for the Canteen during the past two years, Alyce said she would like the Council to consider allocating a small amount of funding to sponsor the grand opening of the Canteen. She wanted to bring this before the Council today to get the approval of the group as a whole for this event. She complimented Pat Merrill's communication with her over the past year regarding the status of the Canteen and she provided detail about the various pragmatic obstacles that have been overcome. She then asked if the Council would support funding the grand opening. Kevin Crowe asked if the opening has been scheduled. Alyce said that a date has not been set, in part to enable the Council to take part in scheduling it. Alyce noted that she would like to contribute to developing and mailing invitations, as well as provide refreshments at the event. Rosetta Johnson asked if the consumers within the Allied Therapy Project could be asked to help design the invitations. Alyce agreed that the Consumer Assistance Program (CAP) staff could work with them on this.

Karen Taycher asked how this would be funded. Andrew and Alyce said there is room in the operating supply and postage line items of the Council budget. Alyce underscored that this would not be too extravagant, probably a few hundred dollars. Dave said that the specific amount is not the issue. Rather, he is concerned that the Council has already funded the Canteen \$8,000 for the year and wants to guard against demonstrating undue favor toward the project. Alyce pointed out that the \$8,000 is solely for employing staff and no funds are available for the grand opening.

Jenita Rodriguez attempted to put forth a motion about funding the grant opening. Mike Doyle pointed out that this topic was not publicly noticed on the agenda as an action item. Andrew Zeiser said that because the Council allows blanket authority over the budget, this expenditure is discretionary. He pointed out that single expenditures do not come before the Council for approval item by item, and therefore do not have to be scheduled on the agenda, particularly since they fall within existing line items in the budget. He suggested that the Council should simply build consensus on whether or not they want to fund this event.

Karen asked if the Council wants to set a precedent for providing this type of financial assistance for such promotional events. More discussion followed. Alyce suggested that the grand opening might be scheduled around the next Council meeting in December. Rosetta suggested that sponsorships might be obtained for this event, and then the Council would not have to fund any portion of it.

Alyce suggested a compromise could be that the Council fund invitation printing and mailing expenses and seek sponsorships for food and other supplies. The members indicated that they would support printing and postage expenses and directed that Council members interested in the project work to obtain other sponsorships for refreshments. Alyce asked Rosetta to work with Barbara Jackson on sponsorships and planning for this event. Alyce confirmed that the Council agrees that printing and postage expenses will be covered. The members agreed. More discussion followed.

Alyce asked if anyone has additional names they would like to add to the invitation list to please let Andrew know.

Judge Cooley indicated that she had to leave early and asked that in the future Council meetings not be scheduled in December.

Alyce then called for the scheduled lunch break and reminded everyone that this includes a tour of the new Canteen facility.

**** The meeting broke at 11:45 am for a tour of the Canteen and lunch, then resumed at 1:10 pm.*

VI. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION: CARSON CITY MENTAL HEALTH COALITION – MARYELLEN WALTZ

Alyce Thomas asked Maryellen Waltz to begin her presentation. Maryellen said the Carson City Mental Health Coalition is the first in Nevada to have a paid staff position, which she fills. The impetus for formation of the Coalition was the Carson City Hospital Board of Trustees. They wanted to increase mental health and substance abuse treatment options in the area. The City Manager then worked with local private and nonprofit groups to develop the Mental Health Coalition. She discussed several challenges surrounding service provision that became apparent to the Coalition members, including accessing services for mental health problems. Maryellen noted that advocacy for persons with serious mental illness (SMI) is also lacking, particularly when attempting to access an array of services. Based on this, Carson City set out to streamline public and private agency collaboration in order to remove barriers to service access and attempt “one stop shopping” for services.

Maryellen continued to provide detail about the work of the Coalition and the integration of services in the Carson City area. She discussed the Coalition’s involvement with the DCFS Mental Health Consortia and the DHR Strategic Planning Committee for Persons with Disabilities. She also discussed other linkages with public and private groups in the area, as well as with State agencies. She then provided an overview of the jail program that the Coalition is implementing to assist offenders with SMI. She reiterated that Coalition’s overarching goals are to link available services, address gaps in services, and reduce duplication of services.

Maryellen moved on to highlight Legislative issues. The Coalition submitted Legislation last session for crisis response teams. For the upcoming session, they are not planning to submit any Legislation based on the State’s budget crisis. The expectation is that for the following session in 2005, they will work to develop bill draft requests (BDRs).

Currently, members of the Coalition meet monthly. Maryellen distributed a copy of their most recent meeting agenda, which lists the community organizations that participate in the Coalition. She then asked for questions. Jenita Rodriguez brought up a BDR pertaining to physical well-checks. Barbara Jackson asked about consumer representation on the Coalition. Maryellen said that they have one or two consumer members on their Steering Committee. More discussion followed about consumer involvement in their work.

Karen Taycher invited Maryellen to provide Nevada PEP with an update on the work of the Coalition on a quarterly basis to be included in their newsletters. Bob Bennett then provided Maryellen a resource guide on consumer and community involvement.

Alyce thanked Maryellen for her presentation. Mike Doyle commented that the integration which has resulted from the work of the Coalition includes recognition of local issues that tie into statewide mental health issues. He underscored the importance of the Council remaining informed about the work of the three regional coalitions in Nevada and supporting their work. This would enable the Council to contribute to their advocacy efforts. Rosetta commented on the formation of President Bush’s Commission on Mental Health as part of the New Freedom Initiative. An overriding issue being addressed by this Commission is the fragmentation of

services and the need for integration. She then discussed the Summit she is planning that addresses systems integration. Maryellen commented again on the need for providing a unified voice to advocate for the needs of persons with SMI.

VII. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES

LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE

Alyce Thomas asked Jenita Rodriguez to begin her report. Jenita said she asked Carlos Brandenburg to attend the meeting today to discuss MHDS budget issues for the upcoming Legislative session.

Carlos then provided an overview of the budget process. He said that shortly the Governor's budget will be developed, which does not become a public document until he shares it as part of his State of the State Address. At this point in time, Carlos can only discuss what MHDS has submitted for the Governor's consideration in developing his budget.

Carlos then reviewed a summary handout of budget highlights. He called everyone's attention to the last page, which summarizes the BDRs being introduced by MHDS for the upcoming session. He explained the four BDRs in some detail.

Carlos then said he believes there are between 40 and 50 BDRs planned that address mental health issues. He brought up a bill that proposes to eliminate the need for medical clearance before persons with SMI enter the State system. This is intended to be a response to the extensive waiting periods at Las Vegas area hospitals. He said that MHDS will likely oppose this because primary medical needs have to be addressed before clients enter the system, particularly if they are in danger of harmful drug interactions or harm from other major medical conditions.

Carlos then said that MHDS will have its Legislative liaison help keep the Council aware of key Legislative issues through Jenita. He would like to have the Council's input on many of the proposed bills, and noted that both Council and consumer input will be important to the Legislature. Alyce asked for more detail on the medical clearance bill. Carlos said he believes it is being forwarded by the Southern Nevada Mental Health Coalition. More discussion followed. Carlos underscored the importance of medical clearance before clients enter the system because of the possible danger to their health and wellbeing if medical problems are not diagnosed or treated. Alyce commented on the importance of medical clearance as well. Again, more discussion followed. Carlos said there are other solutions to this problem, noting that one way to mitigate the wait times in emergency rooms is to contract with private clinics to provide medical clearance.

Carlos then reviewed the budget priorities for next biennium summarized in the handout. These include the following:

1. Restore funding from 3% budget cuts.

2. Upgrade computer infrastructure, primarily at SNAMHS, for billing and data collection.
3. Provider rate increases that result from the Assembly Bill (AB) 513 Committee.
4. Reduce wait lists at Rural Clinics; Carlos pointed out that NNAMHS and SNAMHS are not included at this time because their wait list data was not accurate.
5. Increase Psychiatric Observation Unit (POU) beds in Las Vegas; this is based on the overflow at area hospitals.
6. Olmstead mandated integration of consumers into the community; this relates to providing care in the least restrictive environment.
7. Replacement equipment.
8. Additional PACT staff in the south.
9. Placement for clients leaving the mental health court in northern region.
10. Additional Rural Clinic in Laughlin.
11. Accreditation support for SNAMHS to help with JCAHO accreditation; additional Quality Assurance staff.
12. Mobile Response Team for evaluations in southern emergency rooms to help triage persons with SMI. Rosetta asked if the hospitals will help pay for this. Carlos said that Medicaid may help offset these costs.
13. Full time medical director at SNAMHS.
14. New fiscal staff positions and additional Consumer Services Assistants
15. New equipment
16. SNAMHS storage building
17. Training at Lake's Crossing
18. New South Lake Tahoe Rural Clinic

Carlos said the additional information included in the handout provides backup information on the priorities he reviewed above.

Mike Doyle asked about the Governor's request for budget cuts contrasted with the MHDS requests for new items. Carlos said if the Governor's new tax package is approved by the Legislature, this may allow for funding to support the budget requests outlined above.

Carlos also brought up the new 150-bed facility in the south, which will be modeled after Dini-Townsend hospital in the north. Currently, there is no staff allocated in the budget because it will take up to two years to build. Carlos explained the difference between funds for ongoing operating costs and one-time, capital expenditures to build facilities.

Karen Taycher said that as a member of the Disability Task Force, she sees common concepts in the summary handout distributed by Carlos, but not the common language used by the Task Force. Carlos explained that the budgets were developed back in March. Karen said that this makes sense because work of Task Force was completed later. More discussion followed. Karen complimented Carlos on the tie-in of MHDS budget items with AB 513. Dave Caloiaro commented positively on Carlos' work with Medicaid to support some of their initiatives as well. Carlos complimented Mike Willden's hard work in supporting the development of the MHDS budget.

Rosetta then asked about the chances of actually receiving additional funding, or if Carlos foresees further cuts. Carlos said that if the State's economy does not improve, he does foresee further cuts. Alyce commented on the fact that human services are so frequently cut. Carlos said that to the Governor's credit, he requested budget cuts from DHR as a last resort.

Carlos then underscored the need to address early intervention and prevention for children with SED in order to prevent children from entering into the adult system. He said that the "front door" has to be fixed in order to reduce entries into the adult mental health system.

Alyce asked Carlos to review the service areas that were cut. Carlos said major cuts were made in residential treatment programs in the south and north, along with growth in the medication budget, staff training, all new and replacement equipment, and the psychiatric residency program. MHDS also had to cut inpatient services for the developmentally disabled. Carlos said the cuts totaled approximately \$2.8 million. More discussion followed about cuts within the system.

Karen commented that she would like to hear a similar report from DCFS. Alyce said that Jenita and herself have made an effort to contact Ed Cotton and they are awaiting a response. Karen asked that the minutes reflect that it is not just herself that is concerned about getting input from DCFS. Jenita agreed that she has had difficulty coordinating with DCFS on Legislative issues.

Alyce then thanked Carlos for his presentation. Jenita said she would follow up on researching mental health related BDRs when they become available. She suggested that Dr. David Rosin be invited to the December meeting to discuss the medical clearance issue. Karen reiterated her request that a DCFS representative be invited to the December meeting as well to discuss Legislative issues. Jenita and Alyce both reiterated that they have made attempts to invite Ed Cotton and will do so again.

Alyce also discussed inviting representatives from the Southern Nevada Mental Health Coalition to discuss the medical clearance issue. More discussion followed. Jenita said she would like to invite Assemblywoman Sheila Leslie back to the December meeting to provide a refresher on Legislative advocacy, as was discussed during the joint retreat with the MHDS Commission. Regarding the issue of advance directives, she distributed some informational materials and discussed the key aspects of the issue. More discussion followed about lobbying efforts on behalf of mental health issues.

Jerry Clark said that although he cannot speak on behalf of Ed Cotton, he suggested that the Council discuss with himself concerns or requests that they have, which he can make an internal effort to communicate to Ed. Karen said that she believes that the Mental Health Consortia, which are managed by DCFS, have made recommendations that would be valuable for the Council to review and understand.

WEBSITE

Alyce then asked Kevin to provide a brief update on the website. Kevin said it is operational and that his understanding is that Rosetta was able to post information about her upcoming summit through Rosie Cevasco, the webmaster. Brief discussion followed.

**** The following item was taken out of order at the request of a Council member.*

IX. NEW BUSINESS

Alyce Thomas brought up a problem with a request for information from the Council by Nevada PEP. She asked Andrew if he would like to comment on it. Andrew indicated that he had responded to the request by Kim Hernandez and said he would provide feedback only if Karen Taycher has further concerns. Brief discussion followed. Karen clarified that Nevada PEP would like a written article that provides an update on Council activities to be included in their newsletter. She asked who would be responsible for providing this information. Alyce said that Andrew and herself are the ones responsible for answering such requests and that they should be forwarded to either Andrew or her. Discussion followed about the inclusion of children's mental health information in the Nevada PEP newsletter, including work done by the Mental Health Consortia.

Rosetta Johnson then recommended that Karen be the one to bring updates about children's issues to the Council, since she appears to have her finger on the pulse of key issues in the state. Karen said she believes that this is different than requesting Legislative information from the DCFS Administrator. However, Karen said she would be happy to provide a report at a future meeting.

**** The Chair then returned to the original item order on the agenda.*

VIII. EXECUTIVE REPORT – ALYCE THOMAS

Alyce began by providing an update on Ticket to Work. She said that on November 4, 2002, approximately 4,600 tickets will be issued in Nevada. However, there is no Medicaid buy-in plan and no employment network in place to support them. She then discussed the details of the problems with implementing the program. Extensive discussion followed about the nature of these problems. Dave asked if John Alexander could be invited to a future meeting to discuss these issues. Alyce said that she was asked by John to discuss this. More discussion followed.

Alyce moved on to discuss the National Association of Mental Health Planning and Advisory Councils (NAMHPAC) Training in West Virginia. Alyce was invited to take part in this training in order to educate the West Virginia Council about the work of the Nevada Council. She participated in this training event to provide technical assistance in the same way it was provided in Nevada a few years ago by Joe de Raismes and Margaret Stout. She briefly explained the

challenges faced by the West Virginia Council and discussed how they might draw from the Nevada model.

Kevin asked if West Virginia specifically requested technical assistance from NAMHPAC. Alyce said yes, and noted that the West Virginia Council had read about Nevada's work and asked for a Nevada representative to attend the technical assistance to educate them about some of the processes in place here.

Alyce then briefly discussed the Alternatives 2002 Conference. She said the focus was on peer advocacy and the integration of consumers into service provision.

Alyce then asked Barbara Jackson to provide an update on the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI) Convention in Las Vegas. Barbara said that NAMI is moving at an accelerated pace to achieve eight specific goals and then she reviewed these goals in detail.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

Alyce Thomas asked Andrew Zeiser to distribute the NAMI letter explaining the request for seclusion and restraint data. Andrew indicated this was a follow-up on the request at the last meeting from Bob Bennett to provide data to NAMI. He noted that it was requested by Council members that a formal letter from NAMI be obtained that explains the request. Kevin Crowe commented that he and Carlos Brandenburg will be working with Alyce and Bob to provide the requested data to NAMI.

Kevin explained that Nevada will be taking part in a national initiative sponsored by the National Technical Assistance Center (NTAC) to reduce or eliminate the use of seclusion and restraint in mental health settings. MHDS recently received notification that they have been selected by NTAC to be a host state for the National Initiative on Creating Violence and Coercion Free Mental Health Treatment Environments. Nevada has been selected as one of five host/lead states. The initiative is a three-stage, multi-year project that will endeavor to build competence in a variety of stakeholder groups throughout the country.

Alyce then asked Kevin to discuss the State Emergency Response Grant, which the Council collaborated with MHDS on by asking Andrew to help the Division to write the grant. Kevin explained that the grant is designed to assist the State in developing emergency mental health and substance abuse response planning. The overall goal is to increase the number of staff who can respond during emergencies and disasters to provide mental health and substance abuse services. Kevin mentioned the collaboration with the Council, the goal of establishing a Statewide Steering Committee to contribute to disaster planning, and the planned Statewide Institute to bring together stakeholders involved emergency response. He also complimented Andrew on his work on the grant application. Brief discussion followed.

X. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public attendees were present to make comments to the Council.

XI. SET DATE, TIME, LOCATION, AND TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)

The next Council meeting is scheduled for December 12, 2002. Alyce Thomas said it will be held in Reno so that the Council can take part in the grand opening of the Canteen.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm.